arXiv:1607.02219v3 [math.PR] 16 Sep 2016

Concentration of Geodesics in Directed Bernoulli Percolation

Christian Houdré* Chen Xu †

September 19, 2016

Abstract

In directed last passage percolation with i.i.d. Bernoulli weights on vertices over a $n \times n$ grid and for n large enough, we prove that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the geodesics are concentrated in a cylinder, centered on the main diagonal and of width of order $n^{(2\kappa+1)/(2\kappa+2)+\varepsilon}$, where $1 \leq \kappa < \infty$ is the curvature of the shape function at $(1,1)$. This methodology is robust enough to also apply to directed first passage site percolation with i.i.d. Bernoulli weights, and further to longest common subsequences in random words.

1 Introduction

It has been initially conjectured in [15] that many percolation systems including undirected/ directed, first/last passage percolation falls into the KPZ universality class. They are expected to satisfy the scaling relation: $\chi = 2\xi - 1$, where χ and ξ are respectively the shape and the transversal fluctuations exponents. Moreover, χ

*School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0160. Email: houdre@math.gatech.edu. Research supported in part by the grant # 246283 from the Simons Foundation.

†School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0160. Email: cxu60@math.gatech.edu.

MSC2010: Primary 60K35, 82B43.

Keywords: First-passage percolation, geodesics, KPZ universality, last-passage percolation, longest common subsequence, random words. transversal exponent.

can also be viewed as the asymptotic order of the standard deviation of the first/last passage time, while all the geodesics are expected to be confined to a cylinder around the diagonal of width of asymptotic order n^{ξ}. Specifically, on a two dimensional grid, it is conjectured that $\chi = 1/3$ and $\xi = 2/3$. However, to date, it has only been shown that $\chi \leq 1/2$ and that $\xi \leq 3/4$, under various types of assumptions. The upper bound $3/4$ is obtained in [19] by showing that $2\xi \leq 1 + \chi'$, where χ' is an exponent closely related to χ and is itself upper-bounded by $1/2$. The relation $2\xi = 1 + \chi$ has also been recently proved under different definitions of ξ and χ in [5] (see also [2]). Regarding the bounds for the shape fluctuations exponent χ, fewer results are available: to date, a sublinear order $O(\sqrt{n/\ln n})$, in the context of first passage percolation (FPP) with various types of weight distributions has been shown in [4, 6]. For a list of other definitions and results on these topics, we refer the interested readers to the recent comprehensive survey [3].

Transversal fluctuations have also been studied in a related problem, i.e., the analysis of the longest common subsequences (LCSs) in random words. As well known, LCSs can be viewed as directed last passages in a two-dimensional percolation grid with dependent Bernoulli weights. It is proved in [11] that the optimal alignments corresponding to the LCSs also stay close to the diagonal with high probability. Moreover, when it comes to the shape fluctuation, i.e., the standard deviation of the length of the LCSs, the results are more complete: First, by the Efron-Stein inequality, the shape fluctuations are upper bounded by $\sqrt{n}$, for arbitrary distributions on any finite dictionary (see [22]). Second, a lower bound of order $\sqrt{n}$ has been obtained under various asymmetry assumptions ([16, 10]). More noticeably, a central limit theorem has been proved for the length of the LCSs in [9].

In the present paper, we mainly study the transversal fluctuations in directed last passage percolation (DLPP) and briefly extend it to other settings. Our methodology is at first adapted from [11]. Its direct application leads to an exponential inequality for all the geodesics in DLPP confined to a cylinder, around the main diagonal, of width of order $n^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln n}$, where $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ is the curvature of the shape function at $(1, 1)$. Next, and more significantly, we devise a new methodology which uses this concentration iteratively to improve the order of the width to $n^{(2\kappa+1)/(2\kappa+2)+\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon > 0$.

The model under study is the classical one: DLPP on a $n_1 \times n_2$ grid with $(n_1 + 1)(n_2 + 1)$ vertices, each of which is associated with a Bernoulli random weight w, where $\mathbb{P}(w = 1) = s = 1 - \mathbb{P}(w = 0)$ and $0 < s < 1$, and all the weights are

independent. The last passage time $T(n_1, n_2)$ is the maximum of the sums of all the weights along all unit-step up-right paths on the grid, from $(0, 0)$ to (n_1, n_2). Namely,

$$T(n_1, n_2) = \max_{v \in \Pi} \sum_{v \in \pi} w(v),$$

where Π is the set of all unit-step up-right paths from $(0, 0)$ to (n_1, n_2), and where each unit-step up-right path $\pi \in \Pi$ is viewed as an ordered set of vertices, i.e. $\pi = \{v_0 = (0, 0), v_1, ..., v_{n_1+n_2} = (n_1, n_2)\}$ such that $v_{i+1} - v_i$ $(i \in [n_1 + n_2 - 1])$ is either $\mathbf{e}_1 := (1, 0)$ or $\mathbf{e}_2 := (0, 1)$ for any and $w : \ v \to w(v) \in \{0, 1\}$ is the random weight associated with the vertex $v \in [n_1] \times [n_2]$, where $[n_i] := \{0, 1, 2, ..., n_i\}$. Hereafter *directed path* is short for unit-step up-right path and any directed path realizing the last passage time is called a *geodesic*. We also use the notation $T(V_1, V_2)$ to denote the directed last passage time for a rectangular grid from the lower-left vertex V_1 to the upper-right vertex V_2 (both vertices being included) and sometimes use coordinates to express V_1 and V_2, *e.g.*, when $V_1 = (i, j)$ and $V_2 = (k, l)$, $T(V_1, V_2) := T((i, j), (k, l))$.

Let us now briefly describe the content of the paper: In the next section, we present properties of the shape function of DLPP and state our main results. Section 3 introduces a way of decomposing the entire grid into blocks in such a way that, with high probability, most of the blocks in any optimal decomposition are close-to-square shaped. Then, we exhibit two lines ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 respectively above and below the main diagonal, bounding a sector within which, with high probability, all the geodesics are confined. Following this section, by finely tuning the slopes of these two bounding lines, we produce a concentration inequality for the fluctuations of the geodesics away from the main diagonal. Then, improving the order of the last term in the intercepts, of these two lines, with the two vertical boundaries of the grid, via an iterative scheme, leads to an improved concentration inequality. In each section, all the results are stated in two parallel ways: the first gives a general result for perfect square grids, which serves as the starting case in our iterative scheme. The second presents a similar result for close-to-square shaped grids with a specific choice of the slopes p_1 and p_2 of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 so that they converge to 1, polynomially fast, under a curvature assumption. In the concluding Section 5, similar results are briefly stated for the geodesics in directed first passage percolation (DFPP). Then, the case of LCSs is analyzed and some potential refinements are also discussed.

2 Preliminaries and Main Results

In this section, we introduce the shape function g and a modification $g_\perp$ along with some of their properties. It is well known that, by superadditivity and Fekete's Lemma, the non-negative limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}T(nx,ny)}{n} = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}T(nx,ny)}{n} := g(x,y)$$

exist for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The function g is typically called the shape function, and by a further application of superadditivity, it can be shown to be concave (see [18]). Instead of studying g directly, we are more interested in its orthogonal modification, i.e., in the function $g_\perp$, given by $g_\perp(q) = g(1-q, 1+q)$, where $q \in (-1, +1)$. Since the transformation $(1-q, 1+q)$ is linear, it is trivial to transfer results from g to $g_\perp$. Therefore, from [18]:

Proposition 2.1. *$g_\perp$ is non-negative and concave.*

By the invariance of g under any permutation of its coordinates, i.e., since $g(x,y) = g(y,x)$, $g_\perp$ is symmetric about $q = 0$. Also $g_\perp((-1)^+) = g_\perp(1^-) = g(0,2) = 2s$. Still, by concavity, $g_\perp$ is non-decreasing on $(-1, 0]$ and non-increasing on $[0, 1)$ and so $g_\perp$ attains its maximum at $q = 0$. The uniqueness of this maximum is not guaranteed but would follow from the strict concavity of the shape function g at $(1, 1)$ which has been conjectured, in particular, for i.i.d. Bernoulli weights. To date, strict concavity has not been proved for any weight distribution. However, in the setting of undirected FPP, a class of weight distributions has been shown (see [7]) to produce a shape function having a flat edge around the direction $(1, 1)$. This class of weights is further studied and more properties of the associated shape function are obtained in [17, 23, 24, 1]. Nevertheless, it is believed that in the case of Bernoulli weights, when with sufficiently small parameter, g is strictly concave. So, in our setting to obtain concentration, throughout the whole notes, we assume the following:

Assumption 2.2. *$g_\perp$ is strictly concave.*

Under Assumption 2.2, it suffices to prove the existence of a threshold $t > 0$ such that if $q \in (-1, -t) \cup (t, 1)$, then $g_\perp(q) \lneqq g_\perp(0) = g(1,1)$, i.e., that $g_\perp$ is not identically constant in $(-1, 1)$. Before tackling this threshold problem, let us better estimate $g_\perp(0) = g(1,1)$. First, it is clear that any directed path from $(0, 0)$



Figure 2.1:

to (n, n) in a $n \times n$ grid covers exactly $(2n + 1)$ vertices and the expected passage time associated with any such up-right path is $(2n + 1)s$. But, clearly, the passage time associated with any such up-right path is at most the last passage time. Thus $\mathbb{E}T(n, n) \geq (2n + 1)s$. Therefore, $g_\perp(0) \geq 2s$, but this lower bound is strict.

Lemma 2.3. $g_\perp(0) - 2s \geq s(1 - s)$.

Proof. Consider the diagonal blocks in the $n \times n$ table, i.e., the n blocks of size 1×1 on the diagonal as in Figure 2.1. Any up-right path on this block goes either up-right or right-up. Denote by T_u^i the weight associated with the vertex at the upper-left corner of the ith 1×1 diagonal block, while T_r^i is the weight associated with the corresponding lower-right corner for $i \in [n - 1]$ and T_d^j is the weight associated with the vertex on the diagonal for $j \in [n]$. Then, all these $(3n + 1)$ random weights are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with parameter s. Moreover, the maximal passage time of all the paths going inside these blocks is a lower bound for the last passage time, i.e.,

$$T(n, n) \geq \sum_{j=0}^{n} T_d^j + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(T_u^i \vee T_r^i\right).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} g(1,1) &\geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} T_d^j + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(T_u^i \vee T_r^i\right)\right) \\ &\geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\left((n+1)s + n(1-(1-s)^2)\right) \\ &= 3s - s^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

An explicit expression for g is known for geometric or exponential weights but not for Bernoulli weights (e.g., see [21, 12, 20]). So to obtain a specific threshold t, we combine the lower bound on $g_\perp(0)$ obtained in Lemma 2.3 with an upper bound on g obtained in [18].

Proposition 2.4. *Let* $t = 1 - (g(1,1) - 2s)^2/8s(1-s) < 1 - s(1-s)/8$. *Then, for any* $q \in (-1,-t) \cup (t,1)$, $g_\perp(q) \lneq g_\perp(0) = g(1,1)$.

Proof. First by Lemma 4.1 in [18],

$$g(1,y) \leq (1+y)s + 2\sqrt{y(1+y)}\sqrt{s(1-s)}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume $q > 0$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} g_\perp(q) &= (1+q)g\left(\frac{1-q}{1+q}, 1\right) \\ &= (1+q)g(1, \frac{1-q}{1+q}) \\ &\leq (1+q)\left(\frac{2}{1+q}s + 2\sqrt{\frac{2(1-q)}{(1+q)^2}}\sqrt{s(1-s)}\right) \\ &= 2s + 2\sqrt{2-2q}\sqrt{s(1-s)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

When $t = 1 - (g(1,1) - 2s)^2/8(1-s)s$, the upper bound on $g_\perp(q)$ given in (2.1) is equal to $g_\perp(0) = g(1,1)$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.3,

$$g(1,1) - 2s = g_\perp(0) - 2s \geq s(1-s),$$

which implies that $t \leq 1 - s(1-s)/8$. □

Next, let us define the curvature of the shape function.

Definition 2.5. The shape function g is said to have curvature $\kappa(\mathbf{e})$ at $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, if g is differentiable at $\mathbf{e}$ and there exists $\delta > 0$, such that for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\mathbf{z}| < \delta$ and $\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{e}/g(\mathbf{e}) \in L(\mathbf{e})$, where $L(\mathbf{e})$ is a supporting line for g at $\mathbf{e}$,

$$c|\mathbf{z}|^{\kappa(\mathbf{e})} \leq |g(\mathbf{e}+\mathbf{z}) - g(\mathbf{e})| \leq C|\mathbf{z}|^{\kappa(\mathbf{e})},$$

for some positive constants c and C depending only on δ. Otherwise, if g is not differentiable at $\mathbf{e}$, set $\kappa(\mathbf{e}) = 1$.

Hereafter, κ is short for $\kappa((1,1))$. By symmetry, the supporting line $L(1,1)$ is in the direction of $(1,-1)$. Hence, the definition of κ is equivalent to the fact that there exists $\delta > 0$, such that for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\mathbf{z} \cdot (1,1) = 0$ and $|\mathbf{z}| < \delta$,

$$c|\mathbf{z}|^{\kappa} \leq |g((1,1)+\mathbf{z}) - g(1,1)| \leq C|\mathbf{z}|^{\kappa},$$

for some positive constants c and C depending only on δ. Then, requiring that $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ is in turn equivalent to: there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $q \in (-1,1)$ with $|q| < \delta$,

$$c|q|^{\kappa} \leq |g_{\perp}(q) - g_{\perp}(0)| \leq C|q|^{\kappa}, \tag{2.2}$$

for some positive constants c and C, depending only on δ.

It is believed ([14]) that when $s < s_c$, where s_c is the critical probability for the directed last passage percolation with i.i.d. Bernoulli weights, the shape function g has curvature $\kappa = 2$. But as mentioned before Assumption 2.2, in FPP, a class of weights has been shown to be such that g has flat edges, i.e., there exist infinitely many $\mathbf{e}$ such that $\kappa(\mathbf{e}) = \infty$ (see [7]). It was first proved in [19] that there exists $q \in (-1,1)$ such that the lower inequality in (2.2) holds when $\kappa(1-q, 1+q) = 2$, while [5] shows that there is a (possibly different) q at which the upper inequality in (2.2) holds when $\kappa(1-q,1+q) = 2$. To finish this section, we state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.6. *Let the curvature κ of the shape function g at $(1,1)$ be such that $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, in a square grid of size $n \times n$, the probability that all the geodesics are within a cylinder, centered on the main diagonal and of width $O(n^{\frac{2\kappa+1}{2\kappa+2}+\varepsilon})$, is exponentially close to 1.*

Again, this result is obtained by an iterative scheme starting from a base case proved in the next section. As usual, $a_n = O(b_n)$ is short for the fact that there exists a positive constant C such that $|a_n| < C|b_n|$, for n large enough; $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ is short for the fact that there exist $0 < c < C$ such that $cb_n < a_n < Cb_n$, for n large enough and finally, $a_n = o(b_n)$ is short for $\lim_{n\to+\infty}|a_n|/|b_n| = 0$.

3 Close-to-Square Blocks in Optimal Decompositions

In this section, we prove that, with high probability, most of the blocks in any optimal decomposition are close-to-square shaped. We start with the definition of blocks and decompositions.

3.1 Definition of Blocks and Decompositions

Divide a close-to-square $n\times p_0n$ grid, where here and thereafter p_0n is short for $\lceil p_0n\rceil$, into close-to-square smaller blocks, where by being close-to-square, it is meant that there exists some $0 < \beta' \leq +\infty$ such that $p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta'}, 1 + n^{-\beta'})$. Therefore, as $n \to \infty$, the grid converges to a square and in case $\beta' = +\infty$, $p_0 = 1$, i.e., the grid becomes a perfect square.

Throughout the entire manuscript, let $n = mk$ so that the x-axis of the grid is divided into m segments each of equal length k. Meanwhile, the y-axis of the grid is also divided into m segments. The $(m + 1)$-tuples $\overrightarrow{r} = (r_0, r_1, ..., r_m)$ made of the end points of these consecutive segments on the y-edges, i.e.,

$$r_0 = 0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq ... \leq r_{m-1} \leq r_m = p_0n,$$

is called a *decomposition* of the y-axis. This decomposition leads to a decomposition of the grid into m rectangular blocks, of which the ith $(i = 1, 2, ..., m)$ block has lower-left corner $((i-1)k, r_{i-1})$ and upper-right corner (ik, r_i), and is of size $k\times(r_i - r_{i-1})$. While, hereafter the last passage time $T(V_1, V_2)$ is modified by excluding the weight associated with the lower-left corner V_1; otherwise it is the same as originally defined. Specifically, the absolute difference between the original and modified last passage time is at most 1 and they share exactly the same geodesics and shape function. By an abuse of notation, $T(V_1, V_2)$ is kept for denoting the last passage time excluding

the weight on the lower-left corner. Moreover, the last passage time associated with the decomposition $\overrightarrow{r}$ is defined as the summation over all the m last passage times in these m blocks, i.e.,

$$T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} T(((i-1)k, r_{i-1}), (ik, r_i)).$$

By superadditivity, it is clear that $T(n, p_0 n) \geq T_n(\overrightarrow{r})$. Moreover, as explained next, there always exists a decomposition $\overrightarrow{r_*}$ such that $T(n, p_0 n) = T_n(\overrightarrow{r_*})$, and such a decomposition is called *optimal*. Indeed, we can construct an *optimal* decomposition $\overrightarrow{r_*}$ by taking vertices (ik, r_i), $i = 0, 1, ..., m$, on a geodesic for the entire $n \times p_0 n$ grid. Heuristically, any optimal decomposition $\overrightarrow{r_*}$ should be evenly distributed over $[p_0 n]$, i.e., all the m blocks in any optimal decomposition should be mostly square shaped at least with high probability. To be more precise, let us fix $0 < \eta < 1$ and $p_i > 0$ $(i = 0, 1, 2)$ such that $0 < p_1 < 1 < p_2$ and $p_1 < p_0 < p_2$. Let R_{η, p_1, p_2} be the set of decompositions $\overrightarrow{r}$ such that

$$Card\left(\{i \in [m] : \ kp_1 \leq r_i - r_{i-1} \leq kp_2\}\right) \geq (1-\eta)m, \tag{3.1}$$

in words R_{η, p_1, p_2} represents the decompositions having a proportion of at least $(1-\eta)$ of those m blocks close-to-square shaped. Finally, let

$$A^n_{\eta, p_1, p_2} = \{\overrightarrow{r_*} \in R_{\eta, p_1, p_2}\}. \tag{3.2}$$

As shown in the next section, the event A^n_{η, p_1, p_2} holds with high probability.

3.2 Concentration for Close-to-Square Blocks

We start with a lemma asserting that for any decomposition $\overrightarrow{r} = (r_0, r_1, ..., r_m) \in R^c_{\eta, p_1, p_2}$, the difference between the expected last passage time associated with $\overrightarrow{r}$ and the expected overall last passage times is at least linear in n. For further convenience, we introduce a transformed shape function $g_{\diagdown}$ which depends on the slope of the main diagonal of the grid. Specifically, for $p > 0$, set

$$g_{\diagdown}(p) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}T(n, np)}{n(1+p)/2}.$$

Now, recalling that $g_{\perp} : \ q \in (-1, 1) \to g_{\perp}(q) \in (0, \infty)$ is defined via

$$g_{\perp}(q) = g(1-q, 1+q) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}T(n - nq, n + nq)}{n},$$

it is clear that

$$g_\wedge(p) = g_\perp\left(\frac{p-1}{p+1}\right),$$

for $p \in (0, +\infty)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\eta > 0$ and let either one of following two conditions hold:*

(i) Let p_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be such that $0 < p_1 < 1 < p_2$ and $g_\wedge(p_i) < g_\wedge(1)$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

(ii) Let β and β' be such that $0 < \beta < \beta' \leq \infty$, let $p_1 = 1 - n^{-\beta}$, $p_2 = 1 + n^{-\beta}$, let $p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta'}, 1 + n^{-\beta'})$ and let κ, the curvature at $(1, 1)$, be such that $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$.

Then, for any $\overrightarrow{r} = (r_0, r_1, ..., r_m) \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$ and any $\delta \in (0, \min(g_\wedge(p^*) - g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(p^*) - g_\wedge(p_2)))$ and where $p^* = 1$ under condition (i) while $p^* = p_0$ under condition (ii),

$$\mathbb{E}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n) \leq -\frac{\delta\eta n}{2}, \tag{3.3}$$

for $n = n(\eta, \delta)$ large enough.

Proof. Let $p > 0$. By superadditivity, $g_\wedge(p)$ is well defined and finite. Moreover, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\frac{2\mathbb{E}T(k, kp)}{k(1+p)} \leq g_\wedge(p). \tag{3.4}$$

Since $g_\perp$ is symmetric around $q = 0$ and concave and since $(1 - p)/(1 + p)$ is a monotone transformation in p, $g_\wedge$ is non-decreasing up to $p = 1$ and non-increasing thereafter.

Under condition (i), Proposition 2.4 shows that there exist $0 < p_1 < 1 < p_2$ such that for any $p \notin [p_1, p_2]$,

$$g_\wedge(p) \leq \max(g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(p_2)). \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, for any $p \notin [p_1, p_2]$, (3.4) and (3.5) lead to:

$$\frac{2\mathbb{E}T(k, kp)}{k(1+p)} \leq \max(g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(p_2)) = g_\wedge(1) - \delta^*,$$

where $0 < \delta^* = \min(g_\wedge(1) - g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(1) - g_\wedge(p_2))$.

Under condition (ii), taking $q = n^{-\beta}$ in (2.2) gives

$$cn^{-\kappa\beta} < g_\curlywedge(1) - g_\perp(n^{-\beta}) < Cn^{-\kappa\beta},$$

i.e.,

$$cn^{-\kappa\beta} < g_\curlywedge(1) - g_\curlywedge(1+n^{-\beta}) = g_\curlywedge(1) - g_\curlywedge(p_2) < Cn^{-\kappa\beta}.$$

Symmetrically, setting $q = -n^{-\beta}$ yields:

$$cn^{-\kappa\beta} < g_\curlywedge(1) - g_\curlywedge(1-n^{-\beta}) = g_\curlywedge(1) - g_\curlywedge(p_1) < Cn^{-\kappa\beta}.$$

Similarly, since $p_0 \in (1-n^{-\beta'}, 1+n^{-\beta'})$,

$$cn^{-\kappa\beta'} < g_\curlywedge(1) - g_\curlywedge(p_0) < Cn^{-\kappa\beta'}.$$

When combined with the triangle inequality and the monotonicity of $g_\curlywedge$ on each side of $p = 1$, it follows that for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} g_\curlywedge(p_0) - g_\curlywedge(p_1) &\geq cn^{-\kappa\beta} - cn^{-\kappa\beta'} \geq cn^{-\kappa\beta}, \\ g_\curlywedge(p_0) - g_\curlywedge(p_2) &\geq cn^{-\kappa\beta} - cn^{-\kappa\beta'} \geq cn^{-\kappa\beta}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where from now on c is a generic constant independent of n.

Hence, $\delta^* := \min(g_\curlywedge(p_0) - g_\curlywedge(p_1), g_\curlywedge(p_0) - g_\curlywedge(p_2)) > cn^{-\kappa\beta} > 0$, and for any $p \notin [p_1, p_2]$,

$$\frac{2\mathbb{E}T(k, kp)}{k(1+p)} \leq \max(g_\curlywedge(p_1), g_\curlywedge(p_2)) = g_\curlywedge(p_0) - \delta^* := g_\curlywedge(p^*) - \delta^*, \tag{3.7}$$

using (3.4) and (3.5) and where $g_\curlywedge(p^*)$ is the unified notation for $g_\curlywedge(1)$ and $g_\curlywedge(p_0)$.

From here on, the proof proceeds as the proof, with its notation, of Lemma 2.1, in [11]. Since the weights are identically distributed, in the ith block $[(i-1)k+1, ik] \times [r_{i-1}+1, r_i]$, letting $r_i - r_{i-1} := kp$ and assuming $(r_i - r_{i-1})/k = p \notin [p_1, p_2]$, then (3.7) gives

$$g_\curlywedge(p^*) - \frac{2\mathbb{E}T(((i-1)k+1, r_{i-1}+1), (ik, r_i))}{k + r_i - r_{i-1}} \geq \delta^*. \tag{3.8}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2} g_\curlywedge(p^*)(k + r_i - r_{i-1}) - \mathbb{E}T(((i-1)k+1, r_{i-1}+1), (ik, r_i)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta^* k. \tag{3.9}$$

Letting $\mathcal{M} := \{i : \ r_i - r_{i-1} \notin [kp_1, kp_2]\}$, we then have

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{2} g_\curlywedge(p^*)(k + r_i - r_{i-1}) - \mathbb{E}T(((i-1)k+1, r_{i-1}+1), (ik, r_i)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta^* k\eta m = \frac{1}{2} n\delta^*\eta,$$

while, for any $i \in \mathcal{M}^c = \{i : \ r_i - r_{i-1} \in [kp_1, kp_2]\}$, (3.4) gives

$$\frac{1}{2} g_\curlywedge(p^*)(k + r_i - r_{i-1}) - \mathbb{E}T(((i-1)k+1, r_{i-1}+1), (ik, r_i)) \geq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{M}} \frac{1}{2} g_\curlywedge(p^*)(k + r_i - r_{i-1}) - \mathbb{E}T(((i-1)k+1, r_{i-1}+1), (ik, r_i)) \leq g_\curlywedge(p^*)n - \mathbb{E}T_n(\overrightarrow{r}). \tag{3.10}$$

Combining (3.9) and (3.10) leads to,

$$g_\curlywedge(p^*)n - \mathbb{E}T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) \geq \frac{n\delta^*\eta}{2}, \tag{3.11}$$

when $\overrightarrow{r} = (r_0, r_1, ..., r_m) \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$. Since $\delta^* > 0$ and under condition (i), when $p^* = 1$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}T_n/n = g_\curlywedge(1)$, while under condition (ii), when $p^* = p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta'}, 1 + n^{-\beta'})$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} g_\curlywedge(p_0) = g_\curlywedge(1)$ Hence there exists $0 < \delta < \delta^*$ such that

$$0 \leq g_\curlywedge(p^*) - \frac{\mathbb{E}T_n}{n} \leq \frac{(\delta^* - \delta)\eta}{2}, \tag{3.12}$$

for all n large enough. So from (3.11) and (3.12), and for $\overrightarrow{r} = (r_0, r_1, ..., r_m) \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n) \leq -\frac{\delta\eta n}{2}.$$

□

Before proving that, with high probability, a proportion $(1 - \eta)$ of the blocks in any optimal decomposition have close-to-square shape, we show that, even when the vertex weights, belonging to a particular set, are independently resampled, the absolute change in the last passage time can be upper-bounded by 1. To find such a set, define a set of vertices $\{V_i = (X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ to be strictly decreasing, if there exists a permutation π of $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ such that

$$V_{\pi(1)} \prec V_{\pi(2)} \prec ... \prec V_{\pi(k)},$$

where $V_i \prec V_j$ indicates that both $X_i < X_j$ and $Y_i < Y_j$. For example, on a square grid of size $n \times n$, the set of all the vertices on the reversed diagonal, i.e., $\{(n-i, i)\}_{i=0}^{n}$ is a strictly decreasing set and its cardinality is $n+1$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let a rectangular grid have lower-left vertex V_1 and upper-right vertex V_2 and let S be a strictly decreasing set of vertices on the grid. Then, the absolute difference between the last passage times in the original weights setting and in the modified weights setting, where the weights on S are independently resampled, is upper bounded by 1, i.e.,*

$$|T(V_1, V_2) - T^S(V_1, V_2)| \leq 1,$$

where $T(V_1, V_2)$ and $T^S(V_1, V_2)$ are respectively the last passage times before and after resampling.

Proof. Let Π be the set of all up-right paths from V_1 to V_2. Since S is a set of strictly decreasing vertices, for any path $\pi \in \Pi$ viewed as a set of vertices, the intersection between π and S is either empty or contains exactly one element, i.e., $Card(\pi \cap S) \leq 1$. Thus,

$$T_\pi^S(V_1, V_2) - T_\pi(V_1, V_2) \leq 1,$$

where the upper bound is 1 if and only if there is a vertex $v \in \pi \cap S$ such that $w(v) = 0$ and $w^S(v) = 1$. Let π_*^S be a geodesic after resampling S, i.e., $T_{\pi_*^S}^S(V_1, V_2) = T^S(V_1, V_2)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} T^S(V_1, V_2) &= T_{\pi_*^S}^S(V_1, V_2) \\ &\leq T_{\pi_*^S}(V_1, V_2) + 1 \\ &\leq \max_{\pi \in \Pi} T_\pi(V_1, V_2) + 1 \\ &\leq T(V_1, V_2) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Symmetrically, $T(V_1, V_2) - T^S(V_1, V_2) \leq 1$ and thus

$$|T(V_1, V_2) - T^S(V_1, V_2)| \leq 1.$$

□

Before presenting the main result of this section, recall (see (3.2)) that A_{η,p_1,p_2}^n denotes the event that the optimal decompositions belong to R_{η,p_1,p_2}.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\eta > 0$, and let either one of following two conditions hold:*

(i) Let p_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be such that $0 < p_1 < 1 < p_2$ and $g_\wedge(p_i) < g_\wedge(1)$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

(ii) Let β and β' be such that $0 < \beta < \beta' \leq \infty$, let $p_1 = 1 - n^{-\beta}$, $p_2 = 1 + n^{-\beta}$, let $p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta'}, 1 + n^{-\beta'})$ and let κ be such that $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$.

Let the integer k be such that $(1 + \ln k)/k \leq \delta^2\eta^2/18$, where $\delta \in (0, \min(g_\wedge(p^*) - g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(p^*) - g_\wedge(p_2)))$ and where $p^* = 1$ under condition (i) while $p^* = p_0$ under condition (ii). Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(A^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2}) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-n\left(-\frac{1 + \ln k}{k} + \frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{18}\right)\right),$$

for all $n = n(\eta, \delta)$ large enough.

Proof. The beginning of this proof, which is similar to that of Theorem 2.2 in [11], is only sketched here: By superadditivity, the decomposition $\overrightarrow{r}$ is optimal if and only if

$$T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) \geq T_n. \tag{3.13}$$

Assume the event A^n_{η,p_1,p_2} does not hold. Then there exists an optimal decomposition $\overrightarrow{r}$ such that $\overrightarrow{r} \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}(A^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2})^c &= \bigcup_{\overrightarrow{r} \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}} \{\overrightarrow{r_*} = \overrightarrow{r}\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\overrightarrow{r} \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}} \{T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n \geq 0\},\end{aligned}$$

hence,

$$\mathbb{P}((A^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2})^c) \leq \sum_{\overrightarrow{r} \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}} \mathbb{P}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n \geq 0). \tag{3.14}$$

Then, by Lemma 3.1, for any decomposition $\overrightarrow{r} \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n) \leq -\frac{\delta\eta n}{2},$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n \geq 0) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n - \mathbb{E}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n) \geq \frac{\delta\eta n}{2}\right), \tag{3.15}$$



Figure 3.1:

for all n large enough. Next, we view the random variable $T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n := \Delta$ as a function

$$\Delta : \ (D_0, ..., D_{(1+p^*)n}) \to \Delta(D_0, ..., D_{(1+p^*)n}) \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [-2n, 2n],$$

where $\{D_j\}_{j=0}^{(1+p^*)n}$ is a disjoint decomposition of the weights $w(v)$ over the vertices on the $n \times p^*n$ grid as in Figure 3.1, i.e., $D_j = \{w(v) \mid v \in \{x+y=j\} \cap [n] \times [p^*n]\}$. Clearly, the independence of the weights yields the independence of the random vectors D_j, $j = 0, 1, ..., (1+p^*)n$. Next, by Lemma 3.2, independently resampling any one of these random vectors, say, as D'_{j_0} gives

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Delta(D_0, ..., D'_{j_0}, ...D_{(1+p^*)n}) - \Delta(D_0, ..., D_{j_0}, ..., D_{(1+p^*)n})| \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq |T_n^{j_0}(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n(\overrightarrow{r})| + |T_n^{j_0} - T_n|, \quad (3.16) \end{aligned}$$

where $T_n^{j_0}(\overrightarrow{r})$ and $T_n^{j_0}$ are respectively the last passage time associated with $\overrightarrow{r}$ and the overall last passage time with the weights in D_{j_0} resampled. Note that D_{j_0} is

a set of strictly decreasing vertices, so a direct application of Lemma 3.2 gives that $|T_n^{j_0} - T_n| \leq 1$. On the other hand, since again D_{j_0} is a set of strictly decreasing vertices and all the m blocks, i.e., the blocks $[(i-1)k, r_{i-1}] \times [ik, r_i]$ $(i = 1, 2, .., m)$ in the decomposition $\overrightarrow{r}$ are increasingly aligned, there is an unique block, assumed to be, $[(i_0-1)k, r_{i_0-1}] \times [i_0 k, r_{i_0}]$ containing the resampled weights. Hence,

$$|T_n^{j_0}(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n(\overrightarrow{r})| = |T_n^{j_0}(((i_0-1)k, r_{i_0-1}), (i_0 k, r_{i_0})) \\ - T_n(((i_0-1)k, r_{i_0-1}), (i_0 k, r_{i_0}))|.$$

Clearly the subset of D_{j_0} contained in the $i_0 th$ block is also a set of strictly decreasing vertices. Therefore, applying Lemma 3.2 to the block gives $|T_n^{j_0}(((i_0 - 1)k, r_{i_0-1}), (i_0 k, r_{i_0})) - T_n(((i_0-1)k, r_{i_0-1}), (i_0 k, r_{i_0}))| \leq 1$ and hence $|T_n^{j_0}(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n(\overrightarrow{r})| \leq 1$, which when combined with (3.16) leads to

$$|\Delta(D_0, ..., D'_{j_0}, ...D_{(1+p^*)n}) - \Delta(D_0, ..., D_{j_0}, ..., D_{(1+p^*)n})| \leq 2.$$

Finally, by Hoeffding's martingale inequality applied to $\Delta(D_0, ..., D_{(1+p^*)n})$ and (3.15) yield

$$\mathbb{P}(T_n(\overrightarrow{r}) - T_n \geq 0) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{8(1+p^*+1/n)}n\right),$$

for $\overrightarrow{r} \in R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$. Further, by (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((A^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2})^c) &\leq (ek)^m \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{8(1+p^*+1/n)}n\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-n\left(-\frac{1+\ln k}{k} + \frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{18}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$Card(R^c_{\eta,p_1,p_2}) \leq \begin{pmatrix} n \\ m \end{pmatrix} \leq \frac{n^m}{n!} \leq \left(\frac{en}{m}\right)^m,$$

and $8(1+p^*+1/n) < 18$, when n is large enough. □

Remark 3.4. Note that if, in the application of Hoeffding's martingale inequality, one weight at each vertex is independently resampled at each step, then the exponential concentration fails to hold, since this naively constructed martingale has length $\Theta(n^2)$. This justifies our motivation for resampling weights in batches, i.e.,

$\{D_j\}_{j=0}^{(1+p^*)n}$, of which the average cardinality is $\Theta(n)$ and thus the length of the martingale constructed in this way is $\Theta(n)$. Meanwhile, the directness of paths ensures a finite upper bound on the difference before and after each batch resampling. They jointly lead to the exponential concentration.

3.3 Closeness to the Diagonal

Heuristically, if most blocks in an optimal decomposition are close-to-square shaped, then all the lower-left and upper-right vertices of these blocks are close to the main diagonal of the grid and therefore all the corresponding geodesics going through these vertices do not deviate much from it. From Theorem 3.3, a proportion of at least $(1-\eta)$ of these blocks are close-to-square shaped. This intuition can be formalized in the following theorem, where hereafter D^n_{η,p_1,p_2} denotes the event that all the geodesics are above the line $\ell_1\colon\ y = p_1x - p_1n\eta - p_1k$ and below the line $\ell_2:\ y = p_2x + p_2n\eta + p_2k$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\eta > 0$, and let either one of following two conditions hold:*

(i) Let p_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be such that $0 < p_1 < 1 < p_2$ and $g_\curlywedge(p_i) < g_\curlywedge(1)$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

(ii) Let β and β' be such that $0 < \beta < \beta' \leq \infty$, let $p_1 = 1 - n^{-\beta}$, $p_2 = 1 + n^{-\beta}$, let $p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta'}, 1 + n^{-\beta'})$ and let κ be such that $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$.

Let the integer k be such that $(1 + \ln k)/k \leq \delta^2\eta^2/18$, where $\delta \in (0, \min(g_\curlywedge(p^*) - g_\curlywedge(p_1), g_\curlywedge(p^*) - g_\curlywedge(p_2)))$ and where $p^* = 1$ under condition (i) while $p^* = p_0$ under condition (ii). Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(D^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2}) \geq 1 - 2\exp\left(-n\left(-\frac{1+\ln k}{k} + \frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{18}\right)\right),$$

for all $n = n(\eta, \delta)$ large enough.

Proof. Again the proof is similar to the corresponding result in [11] and as such only sketched. We start with a few definitions: denote by D^n_a the event that all the geodesics are above the line $\ell_1:\ y = p_1x - p_1n\eta - p_1k$ and by D^n_b the event that all the geodesics are below the line $\ell_2:\ y = p_2x + p_2n\eta + p_2k$. Then $D^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2} = D^n_a \cap D^n_b$, hence

$$\mathbb{P}((D^n_{\eta,p_1,p_2})^c) \leq \mathbb{P}((D^n_a)^c) + \mathbb{P}((D^n_b)^c).$$

Moreover, as shown next,

$$(D_a^n)^c \subseteq (A_{\eta,p_1,p_2}^n)^c,\ (D_b^n)^c \subseteq (A_{\eta,p_1,p_2}^n)^c, \tag{3.17}$$

so that by Theorem 3.3

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}((D_{\eta,p_1,p_2}^n)^c) &\leq \mathbb{P}((D_a^n)^c) + \mathbb{P}((D_b^n)^c) \\ &\leq 2\exp\left(-n\left(-\frac{1+\ln k}{k} + \frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{18}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

which will prove the result. To prove (3.17), and by symmetry, it suffices to prove that $D_a^n \supseteq A_{\eta,p_1,p_2}^n$. This last inclusion is obtained by considering all three cases depending on x if (x,y) is on one of the geodesics in the event A_{η,p_1,p_2}^n, namely, $x = uk$, where $u \in \mathbb{N} = \{0,1,2,...\}$, and $uk \leq n\eta$; $x = uk$, where $u \in \mathbb{N}$ and $uk > n\eta$; and there exists $u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $uk < x < (u+1)k$. Before we move on to verify the inclusion case by case, recall again that A_{η,p_1,p_2}^n corresponds to geodesic decompositions $\overrightarrow{r} = (r_0, r_1, ..., r_m) \in R_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$, i.e., such that the number of $i \in [m]$ with $(r_{i+1} - r_i) \in [p_1k, p_2k]$ is at least $(1-\eta)m$, where m is the total number of blocks and $mk = n$ (see (3.1)).

In the first of these cases, we have $p_1x - p_1n\eta \leq 0$ and it follows that

$$y \geq 0 \geq p_1x - p_1n\eta \geq p_1x - p_1n\eta - p_1k.$$

In the second case, by the very definition of R_{η,p_1,p_2}, there are at most ηm blocks having side length $(r_{i+1} - r_i)$ less than p_1k. Since $x = uk$, in the worst case, all these ηm blocks appear among the first u blocks. Hence, at least $u - \eta m$ blocks of the first u blocks have side length at least equal p_1k. Therefore,

$$y \geq (u - \eta m)p_1k = p_1(uk) - p_1\eta mk = p_1x - p_1\eta n \geq p_1x - p_1\eta n - p_1k.$$

In the third and last case, since $x_1 := uk < x < (u+1)k$, then

$$x - x_1 < k. \tag{3.18}$$

From the first two cases, $y_1 \geq p_1x_1 - p_1\eta n$, moreover, a geodesic is a directed path and so $y \geq y_1$ since $x > x_1$. Hence, by (3.18)

$$y \geq y_1 \geq p_1x_1 - p_1\eta n \geq p_1x - p_1k - p_1n\eta.$$

Symmetrically, a reversed inequality can be proved for the upper bounding line $y = p_2x + p_2n\eta + p_2k$, and the result follows. □

Remark 3.6. When the grid is a perfect square, the curvature assumption is not used but Assumption 2.2 is still needed for guaranteeing a pair of $(p_1,\ p_2)$ giving non-trivial results, i.e., confining geodesics into a strict subset of the grid. However, to let the slopes p_1 and p_2 of the two bounding lines get arbitrarily close to 1, so that the deviation of all the geodesics from the diagonal are better controlled, the curvature assumption is now going to be needed.

4 Concentration of Geodesics Within a Cylinder

This section starts with a proposition asserting that, in a close-to-square grid, all the geodesics are, with high probability, confined to a cylinder of a certain width. This proposition also serves as a base case for our iteration scheme which improves the order of the width of the confining cylinder as shown in Section 4.2.

4.1 Concentration

Let us start with a brief description of our methodology. As indicated in the proof of Lemma 3.1, if the shape function g has finite curvature κ, then the slopes $p_1 = 1/p_2$ can get arbitrarily close to 1. However, the rate of convergence of $p_{1,2}$ ($\ell_{1,2}$ is short for ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 and $p_{1,2}$ is short for p_1 and p_2) to 1 is no faster than $n^{-\beta'}$, where β' is such that $p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta'}, 1 + n^{-\beta'})$, as $n \to \infty$. Hence, all the geodesics are confined to a angular sector. In this angular sector, the largest potential deviation from the main diagonal is when $x = n$ and $y = p_0 n$, since $p_1 < 1 < p_2$. Therefore, a control of this deviation requires to study the vertical intercepts of the two bounding lines with the vertical boundaries of the grid $x = 0$ and $x = n$.

Recall that the intercepts of $\ell_{1,2}$ with $x = 0$ are $p_{1,2}k + p_{1,2}n\eta$, where k is the horizontal block length while η is the proportion of blocks in an optimal decomposition with vertical length $pk \notin [p_1 k, p_2 k]$. Clearly both intercepts are of order n. To improve the order of the width of the cylinder where all the geodesics are concentrated in, it is desirable to have the intercepts on both the left and right boundaries of the grid to be as small as possible, which is equivalent to letting k and η be small and $p_{1,2}$ be close to 1. However, all three things cannot happen simultaneously: as $p_{1,2} \to 1$, then $\delta < \min(g_\wedge(p_0) - g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(p_0) - g_\wedge(p_2))$ is forced to decrease to 0. Meanwhile, to maintain an exponentially small probability that some geodesics can reach $\ell_{1,2}$ in Theorem 3.5, $3/\delta\sqrt{2(1 + \ln k)/k}$ should be a lower bound for η. But

this quantity tends to $+\infty$ as $\delta \searrow 0$. Hence, it is necessary to balance the speeds of convergence of $p_{1,2} \to 1$ and $\eta \searrow 0$ with the size of k, as n grows to infinity. On the other hand, as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we can set $\delta = cn^{-\kappa\beta}$. Besides, we also assume that $k = n^\alpha$ and thus $m = n/k = n^{1-\alpha}$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ and let α and β be such that $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and $2\kappa\beta < \alpha$. The event $D^n_{\alpha,\beta}$ that the geodesics are above the line $y = (1 - n^{-\beta})(x - cn^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n} - n^\alpha)$ and below the line $y = (1 + n^{-\beta})(x + cn^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n} + n^\alpha)$ holds with high probability, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P}(D^n_{\alpha,\beta}) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-(1+\alpha\ln n)n^{1-\alpha}),$$

for all n large enough.

Proof. This is a direct application of Theorem 3.5 condition (ii) by setting $k = n^\alpha$, $p_{1,2} = 1 \pm n^{-\beta}$, $\delta = cn^{-\kappa\beta}$ and $\eta = 6c'n^{\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n}$ such that $cc' \geq 1$. □

To visualize the order of the distance at which the lines $\ell_{1,2}$ are from the diagonal, we derive the Euclidean distance from their intercepts on the left and right edges of the grid to, respectively, the lower-left vertex V_1 and the upper-right vertex V_2 as in Figure 4.1: For the lower bounding line ℓ_1, first denote its intercept on the left edge is denoted by U_1^1, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|U_1^1V_1\right\| &= (1-n^{-\beta})(cn^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n} + n^\alpha) \\ &= \Theta(n^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{\ln n} + n^\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Then denotes its intercept on the right edge by U_2^1 whose y-coordinate is $(1-n^{-\beta})(n - cn^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n} - n^\alpha)$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|U_2^1V_2\right\| &= (1-n^{-\beta'})n - (1-n^{-\beta})(n - cn^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n} - n^\alpha) \\ &= n(n^{-\beta} - n^{-\beta'}) + (1-n^{-\beta})(cn^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n} + n^\alpha) \\ &= \Theta(n^{1-\beta} + n^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{\ln n} + n^\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

since $\beta' > \beta$. Therefore the distance from ℓ_1 to the diagonal is of order

$$n^{(1-\beta)\vee(1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2)\vee\alpha}\sqrt{\ln n}.$$


V_2
ℓ_2
$\Theta(n^{1-\beta} + n^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{\ln n} + n^{\alpha})$
U_2^1
ℓ_1
V_1
$\Theta(n^{1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{\ln n} + n^{\alpha})$
U_1^1

Figure 4.1:

Symmetrically, a similar result holds true for the upper line ℓ_2. The minimizing order occurs for $1-\beta = 1+\kappa\beta-\alpha/2 = \alpha$, i.e.,

$$\alpha = (2\kappa+2)\beta = \frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3}.$$

This leads to:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ and let $0 < \beta' \leq +\infty$. Then, for any $p \in (1-n^{-\beta'}, 1+n^{-\beta'})$ and a grid of size $n \times p$, the event $E^n\left(n^{\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3}}\sqrt{\ln n}\right)$ that all the geodesics are confined to a cylinder, centered on the main diagonal and of width $O(n^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln n})$, namely, the event that the vertical deviations of the geodesics from the main diagonal are of order $O(n^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln n})$, is exponentially concentrated, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E^n\left(n^{\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3}}\sqrt{\ln n}\right)\right) \geq 1 - 2\exp\left(-\left(1+\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3}\ln n\right)n^{1/(2\kappa+3)}\right),$$

for all n large enough in a grid of size $n \times pn$.

Proof. Setting $\alpha = (2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)$ and $\beta = 1/(2\kappa+3)$ in the event $D^n_{\alpha,\beta}$ gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D^n_{\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3},\frac{1}{2\kappa+3}}\right) \geq 1 - 2\exp\left(-\left(1+\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3}\ln n\right)n^{1/(2\kappa+3)}\right).$$

Moreover, it is clear that $E^n\left(n^{\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3}}\sqrt{\ln n}\right) \supseteq D^n_{\frac{2\kappa+2}{2\kappa+3},\frac{1}{2\kappa+3}}$, which completes the proof. □

4.2 Improvements via Iteration

In this section, we devise an iterative scheme to improve the order obtained in the previous theorem. We start by briefly explaining our refinement of Theorem 3.5.

Recall that, in the proof of Theorem 3.5, we showed that on a geodesic, any point having horizontal coordinate uk, $u \in [m]$, is always above the line $y = p_1x - p_1\eta n$. This indicates that the lower-left corner (uk, r_u) and the upper-right corner $((u+1)k, r_{u+1})$ of the uth block are both above the line $y = p_1x - p_1\eta n$, which forces the whole block diagonal to be above this line. So the only possible way that a geodesic can reach the lower bounding line $\ell_1 : \ y = p_1x - p_1\eta n - p_1k$ is that there exists at least one block, in any optimal decomposition, such that the



Figure 4.2:

segment of the geodesic in this block reaches the lower bounding line ℓ_1. On the other hand, the segment of any geodesic in any block of the optimal decomposition is not only a directed path but also again itself a geodesic for that block. Hence, by the base case proved in Theorem 4.2, with high probability the segment is confined to a cylinder around the block diagonal of width of order $k^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln k}$, as in Figure 4.2. This is equivalent to saying that the vertical deviation of the segment of the geodesic from the block diagonal has exponentially small probability to be larger than $p_1 k^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}$. If the vertical deviations in all the blocks can be shown to be smaller than $p_1 k^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln k}$ rather than $p_1 k$ and since the number of blocks in any decomposition is a fractional polynomial in n, the initial lower bounding line $y = p_1 x - p_1 \eta n - p_1 k$ can be improved to $y = p_1 x - p_1 \eta n - p_1 k^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln k}$, still with probability exponentially close to 1. Moreover, to fully take advantage of this idea, we can iteratively apply the scheme once the width of the cylinder is improved at each step.

However, in a square grid, the blocks in an optimal decomposition are either close-to-square shaped or very-skew shaped. Hence, we need to adapt our proof of

Theorem 3.5 to close-to-square shaped grid and handle the deviation in those skew shaped blocks. We state the theorem with the subscripts i representing the number of iterations.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\beta_i \in (0,1)$ and $p \in (1-n^{-\beta_i'}, 1+n^{-\beta_i'})$ where $\beta_i < \beta_i' \leq \infty$. Let the probability of the event $E^n\left(n^{1-\beta_i}(\ln n)^{t_i}\right)$ that all the geodesics in a grid of size $n \times pn$ are confined to a cylinder centered on the main diagonal and of width $n^{1-\beta_i}(\ln n)^{t_i}$, be exponentially close to 1, i.e. be at least $1 - r_i(n)\exp(-s_i(n))$, where both $r_i(n)$ and $s_i(n)$ can be respectively lower-bounded by fractional polynomials in n whose degrees depend only on i, while t_i is a polynomial in i independent of n. Let $\eta > 0$, let α_{i+1}, β_{i+1} be such that $k = n^{\alpha_{i+1}}$ and $0 < \beta_i < \beta_{i+1}$, let $p_1 = 1 - n^{-\beta_{i+1}}$, $p_2 = 1 + n^{-\beta_{i+1}}$, and let $p_0 \in (1 - n^{-\beta_{i+1}'}, 1 + n^{-\beta_{i+1}'})$. Let $\delta \in (0, \min(g_\wedge(p_0) - g_\wedge(p_1), g_\wedge(p_0) - g_\wedge(p_2)))$ and let the integer k be such that $(1+\ln k)/k \leq \delta^2\eta^2/18$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D^{n,i+1}_{\eta,p_1,p_2}\right) \geq 1 - 2\exp\left(-n\left(-\frac{1+\ln k}{k} + \frac{\delta^2\eta^2}{18}\right)\right) - r_{i+1}(n)\exp(-s_{i+1}(n)),$$

for all $n = n(\eta,\delta)$ large enough, where $D^{n,i+1}_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$ is the event that all the geodesics are above the line $y = p_1x - p_1n\eta - p_1k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$ and below the line $y = p_2x + p_2n\eta + p_2k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$, and where both $r_{i+1}(n)$ and $s_{i+1}(n)$ can be respectively lower-bounded by fractional polynomials in n whose degrees depend only on i, while t_i also only depends only on i.

Proof. The first part of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.5. At first, we define the events $D^{n,i+1}_a$ and $D^{n,i+1}_b$ to respectively be the geodesics above $y = p_1x - p_1n\eta - p_1k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$ and below $y = p_2x + p_2n\eta + p_2k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$. By symmetry, it is enough to show that $D^{n,i+1}_a \supseteq A^{n,i+1}_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$ and this is done by considering all three cases depending on x if (x,y) is on one of the geodesics in the event $A^{n,i+1}_{\eta,p_1,p_2}$, namely $x = uk$, where $u \in \mathbb{N}$ and $uk \leq n\eta$; $x = uk$ where $u \in \mathbb{N}$ and $uk > n\eta$; and there exists $u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $uk < x < (u+1)k$.

The first two cases are exactly the same as those in Theorem 3.5. That is, when $x = uk$, we always have $y > p_1x - p_1n\eta$, i.e., all the lower-left and upper-right corners of all the blocks in any optimal decomposition are above the line $y = p_1x - p_1n\eta$ with probability 1.

However, the third case, $uk < x < (u+1)k$, needs to be divided into three more subcases depending on the shape of the block associated with x. In the first subcase,



Figure 4.3:

the block is of size $k \times pk$, where $p \in (p_1, p_2)$ and we assume $k = n^{\alpha_{i+1}}$; the second subcase is when $p > p_2$; and $p < p_1$ in the third subcase.

Let us start with the first subcase: to apply the concentration of the close-to-square grid to the current block of size $k \times pk$, it suffices to prove that there exists $\beta_i' > \beta_i$ such that $p \in (1 - k^{-\beta_i'}, 1 + k^{-\beta_i'})$. Indeed, if β_i' is set to be β_{i+1}, then since $\beta_{i+1} > \beta_i$ and $n \geq k$,

$$p \in (p_1, p_2) = (1 - n^{-\beta_{i+1}}, 1 + n^{-\beta_{i+1}}) \subseteq (1 - k^{-\beta_i'}, 1 + k^{-\beta_i'}).$$

Therefore, the event that all the geodesics within this block have their vertical deviations, from the block diagonal, smaller than $k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$ holds with probability at least $1 - r_i(k)\exp(-s_i(k))$, where recall that $k = n^{\alpha_{i+1}}$. Therefore, both $r_i(k)$ and $s_i(k)$ are fractional polynomials in n. By an abuse of notation, let $r_i(k) := r_i^j(n)$ and let $s_i(k) := s_i^j(n)$, where the current block is the jth one in the decomposition.

In the second subcase, when $p > p_2 > 1$, denote the lower-left corner as V_1 and the upper-right corner as V_2 and let V_3 be such that the line V_1V_3 has slope 1 as in Figure 4.3. If $V_1 = (x, y)$, then $y > p_1 x - p_1 n\eta$ and therefore $V_3 = (x + k, y + k)$ is



Figure 4.4:

also above the line $y = p_1x - p_1n\eta$, since

$$y + k > p_1x - p_1n\eta + k > p_1(x + k) - p_1n\eta.$$

Next, draw another line parallel to V_1V_3 with vertical intercept $k^{1-\beta_i}$ and respectively intersecting the lower edge at U_1 and the upper edge at U_2. To prove that all the geodesics are above $y = p_1x - p_1n\eta - p_1k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$ with probability exponentially close to 1, it suffices to prove that the probability for any geodesic to break the segment U_1U_2 is exponentially small. Conditioning on the event that the geodesic touches U_1U_2, there are two scenarios: the point where the geodesic hits the right edge of the block is either below or above V_3: when below (resp. above), denote this point by C_r (resp. C_d). In the first scenario, the segment from V_1 to C_r on the geodesic is itself a geodesic in the square between V_1 and V_3 breaking the lower boundary U_1U_2 with probability exponentially small in terms of $k = n^{\alpha_{i+1}}$. In the second scenario, the segment from V_1 to C_d on the geodesic is itself a geodesic in the square grid between V_1 and C_d. Moreover, since the geodesic breaks U_1U_2 and since $\|V_1U_1\| = k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$, the edge length of the grid is at least $k^{1-\beta_i}\sqrt{\ln k}$. Hence, this holds with probability exponentially small, i.e., with probability $r_i(k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i})\exp(-s_i(k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}))$, which can be upper-bounded by $r_i(k^{1-\beta_i})\exp(-s_i(k^{1-\beta_i}))$ when n is large enough. Recalling that $k = n^{\alpha_{i+1}}$, it follows that again both $r_i(k^{1-\beta_i})$ and $s_i(k^{1-\beta_i})$ can be bounded by fractional polynomials in n. In a way similar to the first subcase, they are respectively denoted by $r_i^j(n)$ and $s_i^j(n)$, where the current block is the jth one in the decomposition.

The third subcase, when $p < p_1 < 1$, is similar to the second one by considering

the geodesic segment as a directed down-left path going from the upper-right corner to the lower-left corner. Therefore, by symmetry, any result on the last passage time of an up-right path in an arbitrary rectangular grid applies exactly to the last passage time of a lower-left path in the grid of same shape. Let us denote the upper-right corner as V_1 and the lower-left one as V_2. Also take the point V_3 on the lower edge such that V_1V_3 is of slope one as in Figure 4.4. Therefore, if $V_1 = (x, y)$, then $y > p_1x - p_1n\eta$ and so $V_3 = (x - k, y - k)$ is above the line $y = p_1x - p_1n\eta$, since

$$y - k > p_1x - p_1n\eta - k > p_1(x - k) - p_1n\eta.$$

Draw a segment U_1U_2 of slope 1 such that $\|V_3U_2\| = \|V_1U_1\| = k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$. Again, it suffices to prove that the probability for a geodesic from V_1 to V_2 to break U_1U_2 is exponentially small. As before we divide all the geodesics touching U_1U_2 within two scenarios: In the first scenario, the hitting point of the geodesic at the lower edge is on the right-hand side of V_3 and is denoted by C_l. In the second, if the hitting point is on the left-hand side of V_3, and denote the geodesic intersects the diagonal V_1V_3 at C_d. In either scenario, the corresponding probability that the geodesic touches U_1U_2 is exponentially small, by using arguments similar to those used in the proof of the second subcase.

We have proved that the geodesic segment within the jth block, whether close-to-square or skewed, is with probability at least $1-r_i^j(n)\exp(-s_i^j(n))$, above the line $y = p_1x-p_1n\eta-p_1k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$, where both $r_i^j(n)$ and $s_i^j(n)$ increase at least polynomially fast in n, when n is large enough. Hence, the probability that the whole geodesic is above the line $y = p_1x-p_1n\eta-p_1k^{1-\beta_i}(\ln k)^{t_i}$ is at least $1-\sum_{j=1}^m r_i^j(n)\exp(-s_i^j(n))$. Since the number of blocks $m = n/k = n^{1-\alpha_{i+1}}$ is a fractional polynomial in n, this probability can be lower bounded by $1 - r_{i+1}(n)\exp(-s_{i+1}(n))$, where both $r_{i+1}(n)$ and $s_{i+1}(n)$ increases polynomially fast. Finally, it is worth mentioning that $r_{i+1}(n)$ and $s_{i+1}(n)$ only depend on $\{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=0}^{i+1}$ and $\{\beta_\ell\}_{\ell=0}^{i+1}$. □

Corollary 4.4. *The geodesics are above the line*

$$y = (1 - n^{-\beta_{i+1}})(x - cn^{1+\kappa\beta_{i+1}-\alpha_{i+1}/2}\sqrt{1 + \alpha_{i+1}\ln n} - n^{(1-\beta_i)\alpha_{i+1}}(\alpha_{i+1}\ln n)^{t_i}),$$

and below the line

$$y = (1 + n^{-\beta_{i+1}})(x + cn^{1+\kappa\beta_{i+1}-\alpha_{i+1}/2}\sqrt{1 + \alpha_{i+1}\ln n} + n^{(1-\beta_i)\alpha_{i+1}}(\alpha_{i+1}\ln n)^{t_i}),$$

with high probability, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(D^{n,\beta_i}_{\alpha_{i+1},\beta_{i+1}}) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-(1+\alpha_{i+1}\ln n)n^{1-\alpha_{i+1}}) - r_{i+1}(n)\exp(s_{i+1}(n)),$$

for all n large enough, where the polynomials $r_{i+1}(n)$ and $s_{i+1}(n)$ only depend on $\{\alpha_\ell\}_{\ell=0}^{i+1}$ and $\{\beta_\ell\}_{\ell=0}^{i+1}$, while t_i only depends on i.

Proof. This is a direct application of Theorem 4.3 by setting $k = n^{\alpha_{i+1}}$, $p_{1,2} = 1 \pm n^{-\beta_{i+1}}$, $\delta = cn^{-\kappa\beta_{i+1}}$ and $\eta = 6c'n^{\kappa\beta_{i+1}-\alpha_{i+1}/2}\sqrt{1+\alpha\ln n}$ such that $cc' \geq 1$. □

Similarly, the intercepts of the bounding lines on both left and right edges of the grid are of order

$$n^{(1-\beta_{i+1})\vee(1+\kappa\beta_{i+1}-\alpha_{i+1}/2)\vee\alpha_{i+1}(1-\beta_i)}(\ln n)^{t_i}.$$

Optimally, the smallest order is obtained when

$$(1-\beta_{i+1}) = (1+\kappa\beta_{i+1}-\alpha_{i+1}/2) = \alpha_{i+1}(1-\beta_i).$$

This leads to $\alpha^*_{i+1} = (2\kappa+2)\beta^*_{i+1} = (2\kappa+2)/\left((2\kappa+2)(1-\beta^*_i)+1\right)$ and naturally $2\kappa\beta_{i+1} < \alpha_{i+1}$. Hence,

Corollary 4.5. *The event $D^{n,\beta^*_i}_{\alpha^*_{i+1},\beta^*_{i+1}}$ that all the geodesics are within a cylinder, centered on the main diagonal and of width $O(n^{1-\beta^*_{i+1}}(\ln n)^{t_i})$ holds with probability exponentially close to one.*

Till now, we have proved the base case where, in either a square or close-to-square grid, the event that the geodesics are confined to a cylinder around the diagonal of width smaller than the square length holds with high probability. Also Theorem 4.3 proves that the order of the bounding cylinder, for all the geodesics, can be improved by a tighter control of the corresponding order, for the geodesic segments within each block in any decomposition. We are therefore now ready to implement the iterative scheme to prove the main result of this paper.

***Proof of Theorem** 2.6.* Let $\alpha^*_0 = (2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)$ and $\beta^*_0 = 1/(2\kappa+3)$. Then by Theorem 4.2, all the geodesics over a grid of size $n\times p_0 n$, where $p_0 \in (1-n^{-\beta'_0}, 1+n^{-\beta'_0})$ for any $\beta'_0 > \beta_0$, are confined, with probability exponentially close to 1, to a cylinder around the diagonal of width $O(n^{(2\kappa+2)/(2\kappa+3)}\sqrt{\ln n}) = O(n^{1-\beta_0}\sqrt{\ln n})$.

The iterative equation

$$\alpha^*_{i+1} = (2\kappa+2)\beta^*_{i+1} = \frac{2\kappa+2}{(2\kappa+2)(1-\beta^*_i)+1},$$

provides a sequence $\{\alpha_i^*, \beta_i^*\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ such that $0 < \alpha_i < \beta_i$ and $2\kappa\beta_i < \alpha_i$, for any i. Moreover, the equation

$$x = \frac{1}{(2\kappa+2)(1-x)+1}$$

has solutions $x = 1/(2\kappa+1)$ and $x = 1$. Since $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ and $\beta_0^* = 1/(2\kappa+3) < 1/(2\kappa+2)$, it follows that $\beta_i^* \nearrow 1/(2\kappa+2)$. Therefore, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists i_0 independent of n such that $\beta_{i_0}^* > 1/(2\kappa+2) - \varepsilon/2$. Then, iteratively applying Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 4.5, i_0 times, leads to the fact that $D^{n,\beta_{i_0}^*}_{\alpha_{i_0+1}^*,\beta_{i_0+1}^*}$, the event that all the geodesics are inside a cylinder around the diagonal of width $O(n^{1-\beta_{i_0+1}^*}(\ln n)^{t_i}) = O(n^{\frac{2\kappa+1}{2\kappa+2}+\varepsilon})$, has probability exponentially close to 1. □

5 Concluding Remarks

By symmetry, it is clear that our methodology for proving the concentration of the geodesics in DLPP is also applicable to the concentration of geodesics in Bernoulli directed first passage site percolation. In DFPP, one studies the minimum of the passage times instead of maximum. In that context, the shape fluctuations g, $g_\perp$ and $g_\searrow$ are convex instead of concave. Then, a version of Lemma 3.1 with the inequality (3.3) reversed holds true. Further, a version of Lemma 3.2 replacing last passage time by first passage time is still true. Then, so are Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.5, Proposition 2.4, Theorem 4.2, Theorem 4.3, Corollary 4.4 and Corollary 4.5. Combining all these results finally leads to:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $1 \leq \kappa < +\infty$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, in a square grid of size $n \times n$, the probability that all the geodesics are within a cylinder, centered on the main diagonal and of width $O(n^{\frac{2\kappa+1}{2\kappa+2}+\varepsilon})$, is exponentially close to 1.*

To gain a more intuitive view of how the concentration order is improved via the iterative scheme, let us assume that $\kappa = 2$. Then, in the base case the order is first shown to be $O(n^{6/7}\sqrt{\ln n})$, while by the iterative scheme, the order is improved to $O(n^{5/6+\varepsilon})$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Again, it is conjectured that the correct order should be $O(n^{2/3+\varepsilon})$.

It is further worth mentioning that our iterative scheme can also be adapted to improve the order, obtained in [11], for the closeness to the diagonal of the optimal alignments corresponding to LCSs of two random words of size n. It has been proved

there that the curvature of the shape function of the LCSs at $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ is equal to 1 (see the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [11]). However, the value of κ (the curvature at $(1,1)$) remains unknown but we conjecture it to be equal to 2 as in the percolation models.

Theorem 5.2. *With probability exponentially close to* 1*, the alignments of the longest common subsequences of two random words are confined to a cylinder, centered on the main diagonal, of width of order* $n^{(2\kappa+1)/(2\kappa+2)+\varepsilon}$*, for any* $\varepsilon > 0$*.*

Following [13], the exponent of transversal fluctuations ξ is defined as

$$\xi = \inf\{\gamma > 0 : \liminf_{n\to+\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n^\gamma) = 1\},$$

where A_n^γ is the event that all the optimal alignments are confined to a cylinder centered on the diagonal and of width of order n^γ. Therefore, from Theorem 5.2, for LCSs, $\xi \leq (2\kappa+1)/(2\kappa+2)$. Moreover, as previously mentioned, the shape fluctuations exponent for LCSs has been shown to be $\chi = 1/2$, i.e., $Var(length\ of\ LCSs) = \Theta(n)$, for various asymmetric discrete distribution on any finite dictionary(see [22, 16, 10, 8]). But, by a conjectured KPZ universality relation with curvature κ,

$$\chi = \kappa\xi - (\kappa - 1).$$

This leads, for $\chi = 1/2$, to $\xi = (2\kappa-1)/(2\kappa)$ which we conjecture to be equal to $3/4$.

The order $n^{(2\kappa+1)/(2\kappa+2)}$ stems from the combined effect of the exponential concentration inequality and the orders of the bounding lines. Hence, to further improve it, we should at first improve the concentration inequality, e.g., via tighter upper bounds on $\begin{pmatrix} n \\ m \end{pmatrix}$. On the other hand, the order of two bounding lines can be improved. More specifically, recall that any vertex on the geodesic with coordinate $x = uk$, has its y coordinate lower-bounded by $p_1 x - p_1 n\eta$. However this only happens when all skewed-shaped blocks in the optimal decomposition are thin rectangles and all of them are aligned before the current block. Considering putting all the blocks on the same reversed diagonal in any optimal decomposition into one batch, then a permutation of weights by batches leads to a corresponding permutation of blocks by batches in the optimal decomposition. Hence, all the batches containing those

thin blocks tend to spread out evenly across the diagonal. Therefore, the worst case, that all these ηm thin blocks occur before all the other blocks in the decomposition, holds with exponential small probability.

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to M. Damron, an anonymous referee and R. Gong for their bibliographical help and their numerous comments which greatly helped to improve this manuscript.

References

[1] Antonio Auffinger and Michael Damron. Differentiability at the edge of the percolation cone and related results in first-passage percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 156(1-2):193–227, 2013.

[2] Antonio Auffinger and Michael Damron. A simplified proof of the relation between scaling exponents in first-passage percolation. *The Annals of Probability*, 42(3):1197–1211, 2014.

[3] Antonio Auffinger, Michael Damron, and Jack Hanson. 50 years of first passage percolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03262*, 2015.

[4] Itai Benjamini, Gil Kalai, and Oded Schramm. First passage percolation has sublinear distance variance. *The Annals of Probability*, 31(4):1970–1978, 2003.

[5] Sourav Chatterjee. The universal relation between scaling exponents in first-passage percolation. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 177(2):663–697, 2013.

[6] Michael Damron, Jack Hanson, and Philippe Sosoe. Sublinear variance in first-passage percolation for general distributions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 163(1-2):223–258, 2015.

[7] Richard Durrett and Thomas M Liggett. The shape of the limit set in Richardson's growth model. *The Annals of Probability*, 9(2):186–193, 1981.

[8] Ruoting Gong, Christian Houdré, and Jüri Lember. Lower bounds on the generalized central moments of the optimal alignments score of random sequences. *To appear, J. Theoretical Probability*, 2015.

[9] Christian Houdré and Ümit Işlak. A central limit theorem for the length of the longest common subsequences in random words. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1408.1559v3*, 2015.

[10] Christian Houdré and Jingyong Ma. On the order of the central moments of the length of the longest common subsequences in random words. *To appear, High Dimensinal Probability VII: The Cargèse Volume, Birkhäuser*, 2016.

[11] Christian Houdré and Heinrich Matzinger. Closeness to the diagonal for longest common subsequences. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 21(2):1–19, 2016.

[12] W. Jockusch, J. Propp, and P. Shor. Random Domino Tilings and the Arctic Circle Theorem. *arXiv preprint arXiv: math/9801068*, January 1998.

[13] Kurt Johansson. Transversal fluctuations for increasing subsequences on the plane. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 116(4):445–456, 2000.

[14] Harry Kesten. Aspects of first passage percolation. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XIV-1984*, pages 125–264. Springer, 1986.

[15] Joachim Krug and Herbert Spohn. Kinetic roughening of growing surfaces. In C. Godreche, editor, *Solids far from equilibrium*, pages 479–582. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[16] Jüri Lember and Heinrich Matzinger. Standard deviation of the longest common subsequence. *The Annals of Probability*, 37(3):1192–1235, 2009.

[17] R Marchand. Strict inequalities for the time constant in first passage percolation. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 12(3):1001–1038, 2002.

[18] James B Martin. Limiting shape for directed percolation models. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(4):2908–2937, 2004.

[19] Charles M. Newman and Marcelo S.T. Piza. Divergence of shape fluctuations in two dimensions. *The Annals of Probability*, 23(3):977–1005, 1995.

[20] Hermann Rost. Non-equilibrium behaviour of a many particle process: density profile and local equilibria. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 58(1):41–53, 1981.

[21] Timo Seppäläinen. Hydrodynamic scaling, convex duality, and asymptotic shapes of growth models. *Markov Processes and Related Fields*, 4(1):1–26, 1998.

[22] J. Michael Steele. An Efron-Stein inequality for nonsymmetric statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 14(2):753–758, 1986.

[23] Yu Zhang. Shape fluctuations are different in different directions. *The Annals of Probability*, 36(1):331–362, 2008.

[24] Yu Zhang. On the concentration and the convergence rate with a moment condition in first passage percolation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 120(7):1317–1341, 2010.